A DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY OF MILITARY SELECTION IN THE STATE OF OHIO, 1917-1919

A Thesis

by

MICHAEL REZA SABERIAN

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

December 2004

Major Subject: History

A DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY OF MILITARY SELECTION IN THE STATE OF OHIO, 1917-1919

A Thesis

by

MICHAEL REZA SABERIAN

Submitted to Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved as to style and content by:

Walter D. Kamphoefner (Chair of Committee)	Lynn M. Burlbaw (Member)
James C. Bradford (Member)	Walter L. Buenger (Head of Department)

December 2004

Major Subject: History

ABSTRACT

A Demographic Study of Military Selection in the State of Ohio,

1917-1919. (December 2004)

Michael Reza Saberian, B.A., The University of Texas at Austin

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Walter D. Kamphoefner

This thesis studies the influence of ethnicity, nationality, and occupation upon military selection of the residents of Ohio during the First World War. This is a quantitative study, based on a data set constructed from samples of the 1910 and 1920 censuses and *The Official Roster of Ohio Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines in the World War, 1917-1918.*

Chapter I introduces the sources and the methodology. Chapter II examines the ethnicity of conscripts, and whether or not ethnic identities affected draft registration or military selection. Chapter III examines the numerical significance of resident aliens in the military population. Chapter IV examines the influence of social class on conscription: determining whether persons of wealth avoided military service and the influence of occupational deferments on the population at risk. Chapter V concludes the thesis by summarizing the results.

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of Helene E. Davis, an educator and a scholar. She lived a purposeful life, working for the greater good by educating young people.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the many people who helped make this work possible. First, I would like to thank the board members of the Helene Davis Memorial Trust, who provided much of my funding for graduate school here at Texas A&M. Special thanks also go to Dr. Kamphoefner, the chairman, who started me down the road of quantitative research and turned my attention to this particular topic in Ohio. Thanks also to Drs. Bradford and Burlbaw who helped refine the rhetoric of the manuscript. Finally, I should like to thank my parents for their financial and moral support during my time in graduate school.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER Page

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

From April of 1917 until November of 1919, the United States was in a state of war with the governments of the Central Powers. This conflict led to a great movement of men and materiel from the American heartland to the continent of Europe. While America's presence in the war remained relatively brief, its effects proved decisive.

From the 1880's until the outbreak of World War I, the United States witnessed an influx of many immigrants from Central, Eastern, and Southern Europe. Many of these immigrants came from states that later constituted the Central Powers during the First World War. Within a generation, some of these migrants or their children would take up arms against their brothers and cousins from their respective motherlands. A study of their military service and the nature of their entry into that service will prove enlightening about shifting national identities and the degree to which these immigrants assimilated into the American mainstream.

In order to raise the manpower needed for warfare in the industrial age, the United States, like the other belligerents, turned to conscription. Americans had not used conscription to fill the ranks of its armies since the Civil War. Historians including Howard Zinn, in his *People's History of the United States*, have asserted that the Civil War was a rich man's war and a poor man's fight. This thesis will examine whether or not that analogy rings true in the First World War. [1]

This thesis conforms to the format and style of the *Journal of American Ethnic History*.

[1] Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States* (New York: Harper & Row, 1980), 230-232.

State of the Discipline

John Whiteclay Chambers's *To Raise an Army* examines the development of the U.S. Army sent to Europe during World War I. Chambers describes the mechanisms and bureaucracies behind the raising of this army beginning with the preparedness movement, and continues with the development and execution of the Selective Service system. While Chambers does not examine particular groups of conscripts, *To Raise an Army* constitutes a very impressive top-down approach to conscription in World War I.

Other works have proved more particular, examining individual ethnic groups or activities at a specific military base. Nancy Gentile Ford's *American's All* examines the assimilative activities at Camp Gordon, Georgia where conscripts from various ethnic enclaves underwent a program of acculturation. Christopher Sterba's *Good Americans* studies the differing responses of ethnic groups in New York during World War I. Sterba studies an Italian-American machinegun company and the treatment of Jews in the American Army. Like many immigrant histories, Sterba's work focused on the New York metropolitan area.

Other studies of conscription have centered on dissidents, conscientious objectors, and pacifists. Frances Early's *A World Without War* studies New York pacifists and feminists who established the Bureau of Legal Advice. Another such history of draft resistance includes Horace C. Peterson and Gilbert C. Fite's *Opponents of War*, which details evidence of exacerbated class conflict during World War I.

To date, the historical community has lacked a macroscopic quantitative analysis of conscription that examines an economically and ethnically diverse region of the

United States during World War I. Such a study of the demographic features of conscripts would have been difficult if not impossible until the introduction of the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS-98) in October of 1997.[2] The IPUMS offers new possibilities for a more comprehensive statistical approach to American social history.

Purpose

This study is a quantitative study of the core demographics of Ohio service personnel and the population at risk for service during World War I. Chapter II examines the ethnicity of conscripts, and whether or not ethnic identities affected draft registration or military selection. Chapter III examines the numerical significance of resident aliens in the military population. In what proportions did they see military service? Did aliens receive their legal exemptions? Did they choose to exercise those exemptions? Chapter IV examines the influence of social class on conscription: determining whether persons of wealth avoided military service and the influence of occupational deferments on the population at risk. Chapter V concludes the thesis by summarizing the results.

Research Methodology

The data set is based on a filtration of an extract from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) for census years 1910 and 1920 in the State of Ohio. IPUMS provides an initial extract of 37,639 persons, a 1 percent random sample of the entire population of Ohio in census years 1910 and 1920. From this extract the researcher

[2] "What is the IPUMS?" http://www.ipums.umn.edu/usa/intro.html 5/19/2004.

selected the population at risk, which consists of all adult males between the ages of 21 and 31 as of registration day, 5 June 1917. This reduced the data set to 3,949 cases. Logically, selecting the population at risk from a 1 percent sample of the state's total population provides a 1 percent sample of the population at risk. The censuses provided information concerning the age, location, birthplace, occupation, ethnicity, language, and nationality of an individual. The census also provided similar ethnic, national, and linguistic information about the parents of that individual.

The researcher then matched the names, ages, and locations of individuals from this sample to the state's military population as listed in *The Official Roster of Ohio Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines in the World War*.[3] The *Official Roster* provided the researcher with the date of enlistment, age of enlistment, location of enlistment, branch of service, date of discharge, and type of discharge. These variables were incorporated into a combined data set in the event of a match. In the absence of a match, the researcher assumed that a given individual did not engage in military service during World War I. While this policy of equating absence of evidence with evidence of absence is not logically sound, the researcher's constructed data set is consistent with other published accounts including John Whiteclay Chambers's work, *To Raise an Army*.[4]

---

[3] *The Official Roster of Ohio Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines in the World War* (Columbus, Ohio: F.J. Heer Print. Co, 1926).

[4] John Whiteclay Chambers II, *To Raise an Army: The Draft Comes to Modern America* (New York: Free Press, 1987), 188.

Limits of the Data Sources

The Family Tree Maker's software (FTM) indexed and coded the *Official Roster of Ohio Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines*. This program is essentially a database of microfilmed images. However, this roster does not always parallel the censuses of the state. Individuals entering Ohio following the war from other states may well have served in National Army or National Guard units outside of this roster. Further, persons who were conscripted and assigned to nonmilitary units such as agricultural, industrial, or other work crews would not be represented in the FTM collection. Also, the researcher had to negotiate the variations in spelling between military clerks and census enumerators. Populations with low literacy rates may well be listed in the FTM collection, but absent from the combined data set.

On the whole, the IPUMS proved quite useful in terms of collecting and analyzing demographic data. While the extract was a single file and most variables are consistent between the 1910 and 1920 censuses, certain locator and core demographic variables were not individually recorded. They were linked to the head of household instead. This includes home ownership, reel number, roll number, and others. Also, the IPUMS extract only had names available for the 1920 census (47 percent of the sample). Therefore, the researcher had to match the reel and line number against the Heritage Quest images of the 1910 census by sight. Further, enumeration dates are not properly formatted so one cannot compute the precise age of an individual on registration day. Therefore, the researcher coded the IPUMS sample against the FTM service records by

matching the names phonetically and allowing 18 months of leeway between the ages of enlistment on the service record and the approximate age on registration day.

Draft Resistance

While interesting to American social historians, draft resistance within the population at risk lacked statistical significance. Only 2,001 conscientious objectors nationwide were deemed "morally unfit," a term used to describe those who would not take up arms and could not produce documentation linking them to a respected pacifist religious sect.[5] The 1910 and 1920 censuses did not code religious or political affiliations. The absence of appropriate metrics and the paucity of cases have caused the researcher to abstain from a quantitative study of such individuals.

[5] Enoch H. Crowder, *Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War: On the First Draft under the Selective-Service Act, 1917* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1918), 59.

CHAPTER II

ETHNICITY AND MILITARY SELECTION

In the past decade, research on World War I has shifted towards ethnic studies of personnel. Christopher M. Sterba's *Good Americans* examines the influence of the war on Jewish and Italian communities in New York, where ethnic military units were formed and added to the Allied Expeditionary Force. Nancy Gentile Ford's *Americans All* examines the lives of foreign-born conscripts in the American Army and the accommodations that the army made to assimilate these groups. Both of these studies were qualitative in nature; and they examined the influence of military service on the ethnic groups. However, interest in the plight of German-Americans during the war has a long standing tradition in the historical community beginning with Carl Wittke's *German Americans and the World War*.[6] Wittke's work catalogs the sentiments of German-Americans through the German language press of Ohio.

Officially, the United States government made it a policy not to draft citizens of enemy nations.[7] However, many American citizens had originated from the several countries at war with the United States. The willingness of these men to submit to the bureaucracy of conscription or volunteer in the armed forces of the United States indicates a degree of assimilation within a given ethnic group.

Intuitively, one presupposes that persons in ethnic communities would have a fondness for the motherland from which their forbearers came. Further, one would even

---

[6] Carl Wittke, *German Americans and the World War: With Special emphasis on Ohio's German Language Press* (Columbus: F. S. Heer Printing Co., 1936).

[7] Crowder, *Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War,* 56.

suppose that in the event of a military conflict between the country of origin and the country of residence, the immigrant would exert greater efforts at avoiding participation in the conflict than would his native-born counterpart. On the other hand, it would appear likely that a person with roots in a country allied with the United States would be more apt to fight for the cause.

At the same time, the concept of ethnicity includes the mores of a given group in terms of marriage and child rearing. This relationship of ethnicity upon marital age and child rearing would have a significant affect on the eligibility for military service among certain groups in the population at risk, as dependency of a spouse or a child was an established cause for exemption from military service in the First World War.[8] For this study, the researcher looked at language as the determining feature of ethnicity. The censuses provide a number of variables that might hint at ethnic or national identity: mother tongue, mother tongue of mother, mother tongue of father, race, birthplace, birthplace of mother, and birthplace of father.

The birthplace variables do not capture the appropriate nuance of ethnic heritage, since second generation persons would have America as their birthplace. Even an examination of parental birthplaces provides limited insight. There remains a wide range of options as the census enumerator may record the region, as stated by the person, or the nation-state of the individual. Poles may be recorded as Germans. Hungarians may be recorded as Austrians and so on. This is problematic because former subjects of the Central Powers tied their Old World patriotism of antagonizing the Austro-

[8] Crowder, *Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War*, 51.

Hungarian and German Empires to their New World patriotism of serving the United States.[9]

The mother tongue of the individual at risk also lacks specificity. Like the birthplace, the mother tongue of a second-generation migrant would normally be recorded as English. Therefore, the most accurate variable of ethnic association is the mother tongue of the father or mother.

Coding Ethnicity

For the purpose of determining the influence of ethnicity upon military service, the researcher divided the population at risk into six categories according to their father's mother tongue. The researcher elected to categorize by paternity, because father's mother tongue is also tied to surname in the census. These categories included: Native Born Native Parentage Americans, Central Powers, Subjects of the Central Powers, Allies, subjects of the Allies (Irish), and Neutrals. Native-born Americans with American parents constituted the bulk of the population at risk at 62 percent.[10] Subjects of the Central Powers: Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Hungarians, and various Balkan nationalities, constituted the second largest ethno-political group at 11 percent of the population at risk. Persons of German and Austrian heritage constituted about 10 percent of the population at risk. Persons of Allied heritage: French, Belgian, English, Scottish, and Russians, composed slightly less than 7 percent. The researcher coded the remaining ethnicities into a Neutral status. Yiddish-speaking people were placed in the

[9] Nancy Gentile Ford, *Americans All!: Foreign-born Soldiers in World War I*. (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2001), 12.
[10] Population at risk includes all males between the ages of 21 and 31 as of 5 June 1917; See page 4.

neutral category since it was difficult to discern whether these were Russian Jews or Jews from one of the Central Powers. Given the miscellaneous quality of the Neutral group and small size of the Irish sample, these ethno-political groups could not be examined further (See Table 1).[11]

Volunteers, Conscripts, and Civilians

In the data set, the researcher employed two methods to determine the relationship of an individual to the military establishment. The first method uses the date of enlistment compared to major legal and political events. This conscription status variable has some limitations. The date of enlistment by itself does not indicate the type of military service a person engaged in. It does not account for the nuances of people who entered into professional and specialized military services. For this reason, the researcher entered the branch of service as it appeared on the service record (See Table 2 & Table 3).

The researcher coded servicemen in the National Army as conscripts, National Guardsmen as volunteers, and the remaining forces (Regular Army, U.S. Navy, U.S. Marine Corps, Enlisted Reserve Corps, etc.) as professional units. National Army units were conscripted for the duration of the war, mostly without prior military experience. National Guardsmen may have entered service prior to September of 1917. Professional units consisted of such persons with specialized skills. This conglomeration of units had members entering before and after the first call of draftees in September of 1917 (See Table 4).

[11] Researcher set statistical siginificance at 100 cases.

The Americans

This examination focuses on the proportion of volunteers, conscripts, and professionals to the nonmilitary population within an ethnic group. In the data set, the researcher defined the Americans as persons born in the United States of American parentage. If ethnicity measures identification with a nation-state, then the native population functions as the control group.

American Natives had a military population of 16.9 percent: 1.6 percent of participated as volunteers; 2.9 percent were assigned to professional units; and 12.4 percent were conscripted. In this examination, the researcher took these proportions as the point of comparison with other ethno-political groups (See Table 4).

Central Powers

Almost all persons in the data set from the Central Powers in Ohio were German speaking. The German-American community had a very visible presence both in Ohio and in the rest of the United States. The 1910 Census recorded over 8 million German-speaking people living in the U.S. approximately half of which were American born. Ohio had a substantial German-speaking population and the greatest number of German language newspapers in the United States.[12] Further, Ohio had among the best-developed and most enduring bilingual schools for the education of German children. Ethnic German enclaves had existed in Ohio since the late eighteenth century, prior to Ohio's statehood.[13]

---

[12] Wittke, *German Americans and the World War*, 3, xi.
[13] Paul Rudolph Fessler, "Speaking in Tongues: German Americans and the Heritage of Bilingual Education in American Public Schools." Ph.D. diss. Texas A&M University, Dec. 1997, 22.

After the assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand in Sarajevo, the German-American press called for American neutrality in the European conflict.[14] The German-American community organized committees to keep the United States out of the war and put out publications explaining Germany's action in the war. However, after the American declaration of war in April of 1917, Ohio's German-American press urged its readership to support America in its struggle against the Central Powers.[15]

The data set shows some differences in the proportions of military service between the German-American community and the native population. The German-American nonmilitary population stood at 85 percent of the group to the Natives 83 percent. German-stock Americans populated the professional units at 2.2 percent of their population at risk, compared to the Native 2.9 percent. As expected, the German-American community did not produce a large body of men for volunteer National Guard units, only 0.2 percent to the Native 1.6 percent. While under represented among volunteers, the Germans proved slightly over represented among conscripts 12.6 percent to the Native 12.4 percent (See Table 4).

Central Subjects

Curiously, persons from areas subject to the Central Powers had lower rates of military service than did their Native counterparts. The Central Subjects had a military population of only 8.3 percent to the Native 16.9 percent. Of the 441 Central Subjects, 23 percent were American born (See Table 4 & Table 5).

---

[14] Wittke, *German Americans and the World War*, 5.
[15] Ibid, 129.

One reason for the absence of such persons could lie in methodological factors: the inconsistency between the military clerks and the census enumerators in the spelling of names. Also, high rates of return migration removed some of the 1910 census sample from the 1917 draft pool. A more likely possibility for the infrequency of military service in these subject populations is the high proportion of the population at risk that was already married. These subject peoples had a marriage rate of 51.4 percent. That is more than 10 percent greater than their native counterparts (See Table 6).

Allies

Persons from Allied countries in either birth or heritage were slightly less likely to have served than were their native-born counterparts. Unlike the Central Subjects who had a higher incidence of marriage, the Allied group only had 32.6 percent of their population at risk bound by family obligations (See Table 6).

One possible explanation for this lower rate of service lies in Ohio's proximity to Canada. In coding the data set, the researcher classified a person as nonmilitary if the researcher could not find an individual in the Ohio Service records. The *Official Roster* did not include foreign military service. Over 13 percent of the Allied population originated in countries within the British Commonwealth. A fair proportion of these could have easily taken up arms in other allied military services. The Provost Marshal General confirmed such events in his 1917 report (See Table 7). [16]

[16] Crowder, *Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War*, 23

Controlling for Factors

Both age and marital status would affect military selection within ethno-political groups. To understand the influence of these factors, the researcher turned to a Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA).[17] Controlling for marital status as a factor and age as a covariate, the researcher found that the American Natives still exceeded their expected rate of service by 0.032 points. The Central Subjects were deficient by 0.061 points from expectations. The German population was fairly close to their expected enlistment rates, having a deficiency of only 0.003 points from expectations. Persons of Allied heritage were deficient by 0.030 points (See Table 8).

As stated previously, the Irish sample was too small to warrant further examination; and the Neutral population had no unifying characteristics for further investigation. Also, many in the Allied group were not listed in the *Official Roster* on account of their foreign military service, thus accounting for their deficiencies in military service.

The high rates of the Native military service can be explained by two factors. First, this analysis groups volunteers and conscripts together. Four percent of the Native population volunteered for service. This substantially increased the group's overall military population. Second, the native-born population consisted entirely of citizens, whereas all other groups had some percentage of foreign nationals who were exempt from military service or served under foreign flags (See Table 2).

---

[17] Multiple Classification Analysis analyzes the variance expressed in terms of deviation from an overall mean. In this case, the point of interest lies in the deviation from the expected mean for each ethnic group given the proportions within those groups who were married and the numbers within groups that were a given age on registration day.

The deficiencies of the Central Subject people, controlling for marriage, can be explained by a further examination of the marital exemption. The marital exemption applied to **dependent** spouses and children.[18] To examine financial dependence, the researcher compared the socioeconomic means of the groups using the Duncan Socioeconomic Index (SEI) provided by the IPUMS. The Central Subjects had the lowest socioeconomic status. Thus, one would suppose that this group had the greatest proportion of financially dependent families. Furthermore, only 14 percent of the Central Subject population was American-born. Fewer of them were subject to conscription and could well have been listed as enemy aliens (See Table 5 & See Table 9).

The German-speaking group had and a comparable socioeconomic status to the Native population. The German-speaking group also had a comparable proportion of citizens to the native population, 84 percent to the native 100 percent. These two factors account for the paucity of their deviation from the expected rate of service. Unlike the Natives, the German-speaking group did not produce a substantial proportion of volunteers (See Table 10).

Conclusion

In the final analysis, marital status seems to be a strong factor in military selection. There remain other factors that influenced military selection among ethnic groups. Factors such as citizenships status and financial independence (wealth) also

[18] Crowder, *Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War*, 51.

played an important part in determining whether an individual engaged in military service. These factors will be examined in the subsequent chapters of this thesis.

CHAPTER III

RESIDENT ALIENS AND MILITARY SERVICE

Chapter II examined the influence of ethnicity on military service. This chapter examines how foreign citizenship influenced military selection. The plight of resident aliens fleeing the militaristic empires of Eastern Europe only to find themselves in the American army has made for high drama among American pacifist historians. Frances Early's *World Without War* includes a chapter where the Bureau of Legal Advice aided immigrant families in their attempts to gain the release of their loved ones from military service. Nancy Gentile Ford's *Americans All* details how the selective service process affected resident aliens during World War I.

The Selective Service Act of 1917 divided resident aliens into four categories: diplomatic, declarant, non-declarant, and enemy. Diplomatic aliens are foreigners in the employ of their nation-states assigned to embassies and consulates who possessed diplomatic immunity. Declarant aliens are foreign-born residents of the U.S. who have declared their intention to become citizens. Non-declarants are foreign-born residents who have not declared their intention to become citizens. Enemy aliens included both declarant and non-declarant aliens from enemy nations.

Initially, diplomatic and non-declarant aliens had immunity from selective service.[19] However, in January of 1918, an amendment to the Selective Service Act made non-declarant aliens subject to conscription. Nationwide 76,545 non-declarant

[19] Ford, *Americans All!*, 52.

aliens found themselves drafted. 9,000 of those were enemy aliens who waived their exemptions.[20]

Problems Coding Aliens

In this study, the nature of the data set imposes certain limitations. Citizenship, unlike ethnicity, has temporary qualities. Many resident aliens subject to conscription on 5 June 1917 may well have lived elsewhere in 1910. In fact, 69.1 percent of the resident aliens in the data set were enumerated in the 1920 census. Further, an alien who had not been naturalized in 1910 could well have attained citizenship by 1917. Further, the censuses do not provide dates as to when a man has filed his first papers (See Table 11).

In the data set, the 667 resident aliens identified by the researcher constitute 17 percent of the population at risk. This percentage stands slightly higher than the proportions recorded by the Provost Marshal General's office, which placed the alien population at 16 percent nationwide.[21] For further study, the researcher subdivided the aliens into political groups based on the mother tongue of their fathers, in the same manner as Chapter II. Among the resident aliens in the data set the researcher found: 136 coded as Neutrals, 152 coded as Allies, 59 coded as Central, 5 coded as Irish, 313 coded as Central Subjects, and 2 Americans (See Table 12).

The two alien-coded Americans were both Canadian-born of mixed parentage. The record indicates that they migrated to the U.S. in early life, and they had not yet

[20] Ibid, 56, 62.
[21] Crowder, *Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War*, 86.

attained their citizenship because they were enumerated in the 1910 census as adolescents (See Table 13).

Among the alien political groups the Allies had the highest rate of military service at 6.6 percent. The Subjects of the Central Powers had the numerical majority with 11 cases and a service percentage rate of 3.5 percent. The Neutrals placed third with 2.9 percent of that group serving. The Irish-Aliens, American-Aliens, and Central-Aliens did not have sufficient numbers to warrant statistical examination. Those groups had fewer than 100 persons. Therefore, any single case could greatly skew the percentages. However, the Central-Aliens only had one case of military service, and this individual was discharged as an enemy alien after five months on active duty (See Table 14).

Resident Aliens in Population Groups

Examining the proportion of resident aliens within an ethno-political group may provide insight into the group's service trends as examined in Chapter II. Aliens or first generation migrants held majorities among the Neutrals and Central Subject populations at 68.7 percent and 71 percent respectively. Among Ohio Germans, first generation migrants only constituted 14.3 percent of the group. People from the Allied states had a higher share of migrants than the Central Powers with 40.8 percent of their population coded as Aliens. The Irish, while not statistically significant, had a 14.3 percent alien population (See Table 15).

Enemy Aliens

The enemy alien population, while statistically insignificant, remains interesting nonetheless. In the data set's military population of 596 cases, only four individuals were found discharged from the military due to their enemy alien status. Combining the troops from Central Powers with those of the Subject nations, the researcher found that a total of 12 men would have qualified for exemption as an enemy alien, roughly 2 percent of the military population. As a whole, only four individuals in the data set exercised that option: a German, an Austrian Jew, a Polish-speaking Hungarian, and a Ruthenian-speaking Galician. This demonstrates the previously mentioned discrepancy between language/heritage and birthplace/citizenship. The Austrian fell into the Neutral category, given his Yiddish language. The aliens in question each spent approximately 4 months on active duty before being discharged. An examination of the *Report of the Provost Marshall General to the Secretary of War* indicates that there was a multi-tiered effort to prevent German infiltration into the military services. The spearhead of these efforts lay with the local boards (See Table 16).[22]

The data set's rate of selection of aliens from the Central and Central Subject states is less than the national average of 17 percent. However, in principle, the government seems to have taken great pains to prevent the creation of a German fifth column in the ranks of the American army. These efforts extended from the local boards to the Provost Marshal General himself.[23] One can also attribute the absence of enemy alien conscription to the efficiencies of the conscription process itself. The selective

[22] Crowder, *Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War*, 56.
[23] Ibid, 53-55.

service forms were very detailed, asking specifically about birthplace, nationality, and citizenship. The forms were transcribed onto punch cards and then sorted by machines, which could quickly identify those ineligible for conscription by virtue of foreign citizenship and send those cards to the reject hopper.[24]

Conclusion

Despite pacifist allegations of clumsiness in the conscription process, the data set seems to present Ohio's execution of selection as sensitive to people's presumed ethno-political allegiances. Few if any were unwillingly placed in a position where they would have to fight their fellow countrymen. Further, the discharge of those enemy aliens who were inducted into the armed forces illustrates the existence and implementation of an effective appeals process. The rare instance of enemy alien conscription illustrates the bureaucratic efficiencies of the federal tabulation process and the nuanced process provided by the local draft boards.

[24] John J. Newman, *Uncle, We are Ready!: Registering America's men 1917-1918: A Guide to Researching World War I Draft Registration Cards* (North Salt Lake: Heritage Quest, 2001), 20.

CHAPTER IV

OCCUPATION AND CONSCRIPTION

Historians such as Howard Zinn in his *People's History of the United States* have studied the relationship between social class and military service.[25] They have examined the influence of class upon whether individuals served or in what capacity they served. In previous military conflicts, some have argued that the rich have managed to avoid military service. During the American Civil War, wealthy men could hire a substitute or pay a fine to avoid military service. Slave-owners could take advantage of the 20-negro law that exempted one white man to supervise 20 slaves.[26] During the American involvement in Vietnam, college deferments allowed many individuals to postpone their military service, often indefinitely. The degree to which individuals exercised those institutional exemptions in other military conflicts remains an issue of study. However, American conscription in World War I lacked those aforementioned exemptions. Still, at the time of the hostilities, as in contemporary times, some have argued that World War I was a poor man's war "to preserve rich men's profits."[27] So the question arises as to whether men of wealth could and did avoid military service.

In the selective service process, a man would receive a number after registration. If his number were called, he would report to an appointed place to be examined by the conscription board to determine his moral, physical, and legal fitness for military service. The supervisors of these proceedings consisted of the county clerk, the county

---

[25] Zinn, *People's History of the United States*, 230-232.
[26] James M. McPherson, *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf: 1982), 181.
[27] H.C. Peterson & Gilbert C. Fite, *Opponents of War: 1917-1918* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957), 38.

sheriff, and the county physician.[28] One might suppose that wealthier people would more often seek medical disqualification, since wealthier people tend to have better access to health care. A man of wealth might know his physician personally. Thus, he could procure a medical disqualification or have one genuinely discovered. At the same time, one also supposes that wealthier people had better nutrition; and they would have a better chance of being found physically fit for military service. Indeed, the local boards found one third of the men called to service to be physically unfit.[29] In this study of Ohio conscripts, the researcher examined the data set for differing patterns of enlistment and conscription between the social classes to determine whether *de facto* exemptions existed for the upper classes in the absence of statutory exemptions for the same. Also, the researcher explored the influence of vocational exemptions on the military population.

Coding for Class

Neither the 1910 nor the 1920 censuses list wealth among their records. However, the occupations held by individuals provide insight into their income and, by extension, their wealth. The IPUMS coded the occupations listed in the censuses to their 1950 equivalents. The IPUMS also features a constructed a variable, the Duncan Socio-Economic Index (SEI), which ranks the mean income of these mid-twentieth century occupational codes across all of the censuses.

---

[28] Newman, *Uncle, we are ready!*, 4, 20.
[29] Allan R. Millett & Peter Maslowski, *For the Common Defense: A Military History of the United States of America* (New York: Free Press, 1984), 332.

Prima facie, the argument that the rich could avoid military service appears accurate, when one examines the correlation between income, through the SEI, and military service as a binary variable. One observes an inverse relationship between income and military service with a Pearson's R of -0.13. However, there are problems with simply using income as the sole determinant of class. Class, age, and marital status are all associated with the income variable (See Table 17)

To examine class, the researcher divided the occupations into six categories: unemployed, white-collar, skilled blue-collar, unskilled blue-collar, farm managers/owners, and farm workers. In the population at risk, one finds 18.6 percent employed in white-collar work, 17.9 percent performing unskilled blue-collar work, 34 percent working as skilled blue-collar workers, 4.3 percent were farm owners/managers, 11.2 percent were farm workers, and 13.9 percent were unemployed (See Table 18).

Skilled workers constituted the bulk of the population at risk in the data set. In like manner, the military population consisted of: 29.9 percent skilled blue-collar workers, 13.8 percent unskilled blue-collar workers, 10.2 percent as farm laborers, 22 percent unemployed, 21.3 percent white-collar workers, and 2.9 percent farm owners. The first three categories create a working-class construct constituting 53.9 percent of the military force. However, these statistics do not adequately represent the status of the population that the data set coded as "unemployed" (See Table 19).

The Unemployed

One finds a large portion of the population at risk categorized as unemployed. By no means should one think that 13 percent of the population at risk was unemployed

at the time of registration. Rather, a substantial number of men who became eligible for conscription in 1917 were mere children in the 1910 Census. Of the men categorized as unemployed, 92 percent were collected from the 1910 Census. As one would expect, the employment rate increases in proportion to age (See Table 20 & Table 21).

The youngest age at 21 in 1917 (14 in 1910) had an employment rate of only 60 percent, 22-year olds had a higher employment rate at 69 percent, and 23-year olds had an employment rate of 76 percent. This upward progression continues toward full employment. The employment rate does not surpass 90 percent until age 26, and the data set arrives closest to full employment at age 31. For this reason, one has to control for age in one's examination of a man's conscription and whether or not these differences in conscription patterns are consistent with known deferments such as marital status or occupational deferments (See Table 22).

Ceteris paribus, the unemployed population would break down into the other classes in proportions of 22 percent white-collar, 40 percent skilled blue-collar, and 20 percent unskilled blue-collar, 13 percent farm workers, and 5 percent farm owners/managers. The researcher can assume that the breakdown would more heavily favor unskilled workers and farm laborers, since new entries to the work force typically do not begin their careers in the skilled worker category. To simplify things one can remove the unemployed from the data set, letting stand the existing proportions among employed members of the population at risk. Thus the new working class construct consists of the 20.8 percent of the population in unskilled industrial work, 39.5 percent

in skilled industrial work, and 13 percent employed as farm laborers. This gives us a total of 73.3 percent of the population in this working class construct (See Table 23).

In the data set one observes 131 persons coded as unemployed in the military population. If one assumes that 73.3 percent of that population falls into the working class in proportion to the population at large, then add another 96 persons to the 82 unskilled industrial workers, 178 skilled workers, and 61 farm workers. The resulting 417 men constitute 70 percent of the military population, including those coded as unemployed. This has an effect comparable to removing the unemployed from examination (See Table 23).

Age as a Factor

In examining age, one finds white-collar workers, as a group, are comparable in age to their low blue-collar counterparts. Following the conventional wisdom, one would expect a similar volunteer and conscription rates among the unskilled blue-collar workers in comparison to the white-collar workers. On the contrary, the white-collar workers had a higher rate of volunteers and conscripts than did their unskilled blue-collar counterparts. Farm owners had the highest age average among the socioeconomic statuses and the lowest conscription rate. In this regard, age and conscription seem proportionate (See Table 24).

In addition to controlling for age in terms of employment, the researcher also has to control for age in terms of marital/family deferments. The conventional wisdom would have younger men over-represented in the military population through

conscription and volition. Younger men would not have the burdens of supporting families. Thus, they would be more apt to be conscripted or to volunteer.

Examining the class breakdowns draws the conventional wisdom into question. The persons coded as unemployed seem to fit this model of age and military service. They have an average age three years less than the other categories, and they had the lowest nonmilitary population of any socioeconomic status. This low nonmilitary population derives from proportionately higher military service in both volunteering and conscription (See Table 25 & Table 26).

In fact, the Provost Marshal General's office anticipated that certain members of the population at risk would be more useful to the nation in their capacity as agricultural or industrial workers. In the state of Ohio, 7,600 of the men called to service petitioned for exemption based on their occupation: 4,127 for agriculture and 1,297 for other industries. Approximately 40 percent of these exemption applications were approved. 1,716 of the agricultural workers and 1,297 industrial workers were allowed to remain in their employment at that time.[30] This substantial number of successful exemptions would account for the discrepancy in proportions between white and blue-collar workers during the First World War (See Table 27).

Marital Status

A cross-class examination of marital rates brings the initial assertions about the primacy of marriage as a military selection determinant into question. However, given the temporary quality of marriage, the researcher can only examine the marital status of

[30] Crowder, *Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War*, 89.

cases enumerated in the 1920 census. However, confining the examination to the 1920 census renders the unemployed and farm labor groups numerically insufficient for further study. However, a study of the remaining white-collar, unskilled blue-collar, skilled blue-collar, and farm owner/manager groups proves insightful.

Among the remaining groups, the white-collar workers had the highest rate of service, 16 percent. Skilled blue-collar workers placed second with 12.6 percent serving. Farm owners/managers had a service rate of 12.5 percent. Unskilled blue-collar workers had the lowest rate of service at 12.1 percent. White-collar workers did not have the lowest rate of marriage among the remaining groups. Only 64 percent of white-collar workers were married. Unskilled blue-collar workers and farm owner/managers had higher rates of marriage at 70.2 percent and 86.7 percent respectively. Skilled blue-collar workers had a lower rate of marriage at 61.2 percent (See Table 28 & Table 29)

Thus, the upper classes, white-collar workers, and farm owners/managers had higher rates of marriage and higher rates of service. One may attribute the high rate of white-collar service in World War I to the absence of student deferments. Only students of divinity could apply for exemptions from military service, and the draft boards grudgingly accepted those. Students of universities and technical schools received no such exemptions. Instead they were channeled into the Officer Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps (ERC). The Provost Marshal General was adamant about the prerogative of his office to call upon college students during the conflict.[31]

[31] Crowder, *Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War,* 159, 36.

Controlling for Factors

Although marital status and age are collinear and each has some association with military selection, one must control for both of these factors to determine the influence of socioeconomic status on military selection. A multiple classification analysis (MCA) shows that white-collar workers and farm owners/managers exceeded their expectations of service if one takes age and marital status into consideration. Under the same controls, the blue-collar workers, skilled and unskilled, fell short of their expected rates of service (Table 30 & Table 31).

Age and marital status controls make a marked difference in the agricultural communities. Without these controls, farm owners/managers fall short of the expected mean by 0.009 points; and the farm workers exceed expectations by 0.22 points. Controlling for age and marriage, farm owners/managers exceed the expected mean by 0.22 points; and farm workers fell short by 0.009 points. This constitutes a reverse between the groups in terms of service in identical proportions (See Table 31).

Conclusion

In closing, the argument that World War I was a poor man's fight has some validity, when examining the military population as a whole. Of course, the majority of the military population would be of working class origins, but this merely reflected the makeup of the draft pool and the society at large. The class argument approaches absurdity in this regard. The real question is whether workers served disproportionately to their numbers, and whether the upper class eschewed military service. This study proves that, in Ohio, neither held true. The upper classes contributed more than their

share to both volunteer and conscript units despite a higher proportion of marriage among these social classes. In this regard, conscription served as a societal equalizer as persons of higher prestige disproportionately served the nation-state in arms while the lower classes were more likely to serve the state in labor.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The selective service system represented a turning point in the raising of America's armies. For America's succeeding wars until 1973, the government used a mix of conscripts and volunteers. However, with this more organized system of conscription, the government no longer relied upon the states to furnish the necessary manpower in times of crisis.

Ultimately, the Selective Service System applied the progressive ideals of social efficiency and central control to military affairs, thereby creating an effective and even-handed an approach for raising the manpower resources for the United States during its period of belligerency. The presence of Progressive methodology can also be seen through the measures that American social scientists took to evaluate society based on the army raised from the people. Government-sponsored social scientists administered IQ tests to the conscripts. These same social scientists attempted to assimilate foreigners through the training techniques at Camp Gordon. [32]

The system proved itself egalitarian, conscripting across ethnic and class lines in terms of a man's capacity to bear the burden of military service. The ability to conscript across ethnic identities in the enclaves of Ohio illustrates a level of acceptance of conscription among the population, especially among the German Americans. These German Americans, while not eager to volunteer, did not shirk from their obligation to

[32] Ford, *Americans All*, 12.

the nation-state. The evenness of distribution across these ethnic groups shows a high degree of assimilation inside these enclaves.

Selective service also had a capacity for nuance, allowing exemptions for men with dependent spouses and children. The system also proved very efficient in screening out conflicts between national objectives and birth-loyalties of would-be soldiers. The draft boards did their best to avoid creating a German fifth column in the American army. Even where the screening process broke down, the army had an appeals process whereby enemy aliens could be evaluated and released from active duty in a reasonably brief span of time.

Selective service showed itself to be egalitarian, conscripting members of the upper class at rates comparable to, if not beyond, those of the working class. Indeed, members of the upper- classes appear to have been proportionately over-represented. As industrial workers and farmers applied for exemptions, the white-collar workers were placed in the National Army and the Enlisted Reserve Corps. The high proportion of white-collar workers in the military population should come as no surprise. The material needs of the nation-state were best served by the members of the working class in the factories and the fields maintaining the means of production in support of the military machine.

Avenues for Further Research

Using the public use samples and available service records, one can examine the application of conscription in other states of the union. States of interest would include Minnesota, home of the New Ulm draft riot, or other regions with notorious displays of

dissent. A service record/census grouping of New York would provide valuable insight, given that New York also took a military census in 1917. New York also had ethnic military units among other ethnic institutions, like Ford's all-Italian machinegun company in *Americans All.* Southwestern states and territories would also make for good points of examination. Did proximity to the instabilities of Mexico spur volunteering in that area? Another study might include additional states with proximity to Canada to determine the scale of trans-border recruiting.

Epilogue

In many respects, the 1917 selective service system operated with greater equity than later drafts. As the years progressed, the number of exemptions grew. Instead of confining academic exemptions to divinity students, as it did in 1917, the government expanded the exemption to all college students by the 1960's.[33] This gave universities the manpower to become important centers of gravity against conscription, and American military activities in Southeast Asia.

By 1973, the all-volunteer force replaced the mixture of enlistees and draftees that previously staffed the American military forces. However, the government maintains the selective service system of registration and tabulation. As the domestic security services struggle with manpower shortages and the military copes with the human demands of extending the American *imperium*, the issue of the draft has returned to the fore. In January of 2003, Rep. Charles Rangel of New York proposed the

[33] George Q. Flynn, "Conscription and Equity in Western Democracies, 1940-75" *Journal of Contemporary History* 33 (Jan. 1998): 7.

reinstitution of the military draft associated with the selective service to increase the size of the Army, on account of manpower shortages in Iraq.[34]

So the young men of the nation file those little selective service cards away for when they need those numbers for job applications or financial aid forms. The occasional public service announcement has become so much background noise since the selective service cards have no teeth without the draft. Still, they remain in every citizen's home as a reminder that the exigencies of modern statecraft can force even a Lockean nation founded on the principles of life, liberty, and property to resort to the Rousseauvian notion of the life-debt. The citizen becomes bound to the state in treasure and blood for it is only in the security of the state that he is allowed to live.[35]

[34] Edward Epstein, "Draft unlikely soon but hot topic now," *San Francisco Chronicle*, May 2, 2004: A 16.
[35] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, Maurice Cranston transl. (New York: Penguin, 1968), 78.

REFERENCES

Chambers, John Whiteclay II. *To Raise an Army: The Draft Comes to Modern America*. New York: Free Press, 1987.

Crowder, Enoch H. *Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War: On the First Draft under the Selective-Service Act, 1917*. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1918.

Early, Frances. *A World Without War: How U.S. Feminists and Pacifists Resisted World War I*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1997.

Epstein, Edward. "Draft unlikely soon but hot topic now." *San Francisco Chronicle*, May 2, 2004: A16.

Fessler, Paul Rudolph. "Speaking in Tongues: German Americans and the Heritage of Bilingual Education in American Public Schools." PhD. Diss., Texas A&M University. Dec. 1997.

Flynn, George Q. "Conscription and Equity in Western Democracies, 1940-75" *Journal of Contemporary History* 33, Jan. 1998.

Ford, Nancy Gentile. *Americans All!: Foreign-born Soldiers in World War I.* College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2001.

McPherson, James M. *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982.

Millett, Allan R. & Peter Maslowski. *For the Common Defense: A Military History of the United States of America*. New York: Free Press, 1984.

Newman, John J. *Uncle, We are Ready!: Registering America's Men: 1917-1918: A Guide to Researching World War I Draft Registration Cards*. North Salt Lake: Heritage Quest, 2001.

Official Roster of Ohio Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines in the World War, 1917-1918. (Columbus, Ohio: F.J. Heer Print. Co., 1926), indexed by Infolink, Inc., CD-ROM, 2000.

Peterson, Horace Cornelius & Gilbert C. Fite. *Opponents of War: 1917-1918*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *The Social Contract*. Maurice Cranston transl., New York: Penguin, 1968.

Ruggles, Steven, Matthew Sobek, et al. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 3.0*. Minneapolis: Historical Census Projects, University of Minnesota, 2003.

Wittke, Carl. *German Americans and the World War: With Special Emphasis on Ohio's German Language Press*. Columbus: F. S. Heer Printing Co., 1936.

Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States: The Civil War to the Present*. New York: New Press, 2003.

Supplemental Sources Consulted

Archdeacon, Thomas J. *Becoming American: An Ethnic History*. New York: Free Press, 1983.

_____. *Correlation and Regression Analysis: A Historian's Guide*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.

Barton, Donald Scott. "The Myth of the Hoovercrats: Alienation, Mobilization, and the New Deal Realignment in Texas." M.A. thesis, Texas A&M University, May 1987.Coffman, Edward M. *The War to End all Wars: The American Military Experience in World War I*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Conlin, Joseph R., ed. *At the Point of Production: The Local History of the I.W.W.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981.

DeBenedetti, Charles. *The Peace Reform in American History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980.

Escouflaire, R.C. *Ireland: An Enemy of the Allies?* New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1920.

Hoehling, A. A. *The Great Epidemic*. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1961.

Kamphoefner, Walter D. "German American Bilingualism: *Cui Malo*? Mother Tongue and Socioeconomic Status among the Second Generation in 1940." *International Migration Review* 38 (2004).

Lindaman, Matthew. "*Heimat* in the Heartland: The Significance of an Ethnic Newspaper." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 23 (2004).

O' Donnel, Charles James and Brendan Clifford. *Ireland and the Great War: The Irish Insurrection of 1916 Set in its Context of the World War*. Belfast, Ireland: Athol, 1992.

Sterba, Christopher M. *Good Americans: Italian and Jewish Americans During the First World War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Trask, David F., ed. *World War I at Home: Readings on American Life 1914-1920*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1970.

Watkins, Susan Cotts. *After Ellis Island: Newcomers and Natives in the 1910 Census*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1994.

Wittke, Carl, ed. *Ohio in the Twentieth Century: 1900-1938*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Association, 1942.

1980 Census of Population. Volume 1: Characteristics of the Population. Chapter C: General Social and Economic Characteristics. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1983.

APPENDIX

Table 1 **Political Status Paternal for Population at Risk**

	Frequency	Percent
Neutral	306	7.8
Allied	261	6.6
Central	418	10.6
Irish	35	.9
Central Subject	441	11.2
American	2473	62.9
Total	3934	100.0

Table 2 Crosstabulation of Political with Conscription Status

% within Political Status Paternal

		Conscription Status							
		N	Nonmilitary	Maybe influenced by events overseas	Volunteered ante Registration	Volunteered post registration	Conscripted	Entered Prior to Conflict	Total
Political Status Paternal	Neutral	306	93.4%			1.5%	5.1%		100.0%
	Allied	261	85.0%	.3%	1.1%	1.3%	11.8%	.5%	100.0%
	Central	418	85.0%	.2%	.7%	.5%	13.3%	.2%	100.0%
	Irish	35	74.3%		2.9%		22.9%		100.0%
	Central Subject	441	91.6%	.5%	.5%	.2%	6.8%	.5%	100.0%
	American	2473	83.1%	.7%	.9%	1.3%	13.9%	.2%	100.0%
Total		3934	84.9%	.5%	.8%	1.1%	12.5%	.2%	100.0%

Table 3 **Crosstabulation of Branch of Service with Enlistment Status**

Count

Branch of Service	Enlistment Status						
	Nonmilitary	Maybe influenced by events overseas	Volunteered ante Registration	Volunteered post registration	Conscripted	Entered Prior to Conflict	Total
Civilian	3338	0	0	0	0	0	3338
Engineers	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Enlisted Reserve Corp	0	0	2	4	8	0	14
Field Artillery	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Infantry	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Medical Corps	0	0	0	3	2	1	6
Medical Department	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
National Army	0	1	2	4	435	2	444
National Guard	0	11	21	15	3	0	50
Officer's Reserve Corps	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Quarter Master's Corps	0	0	0	1	2	0	3
Regular Army	0	9	5	9	24	5	52
Transportation Corps	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
U.S. Marine Corps	0	0	0	1	4	0	5
U.S. Navy	0	0	0	2	6	0	8
U.S. Navy Reserve Fleet	0	0	2	1	5	0	8
Total	3338	21	33	42	491	9	3934

Table 4 Crosstabulation of Political Status with Military Status

% within Political Status Paternal

		Branch of Service Recoded					
		N	Nonmilitary	Conscript	Volunteer	Professional	Total
Political Status Paternal	Neutral	306	93.4%	5.1%	1.0%	.5%	100.0%
	Allied	261	85.0%	11.3%	1.1%	2.7%	100.0%
	Central	418	85.0%	12.6%	.2%	2.2%	100.0%
	Irish	35	74.3%	17.1%	2.9%	5.7%	100.0%
	Central Subject	441	91.6%	6.1%	.5%	1.8%	100.0%
	American	2473	83.1%	12.4%	1.6%	2.9%	100.0%
Total		3934	84.9%	11.3%	1.3%	2.6%	100.0%

Table 5 Birthplaces of Central Subjects

	Frequency	Percent
United States	100	22.7
Greece	13	2.9
Austria	47	10.7
Austria-Hungary	5	1.1
Bulgaria	1	.2
Czechoslovakia	10	2.3
Bohemia	20	4.5
Bohemia-Moravia	1	.2
Slovakia	10	2.3
Germany	9	2.0
Prussia, nec	1	.2
Hungary	72	16.3
Poland	29	6.6
Austrian Poland	2	.5
Galicia	15	3.4
German Poland	2	.5
West Prussia	1	.2
Russian Poland	25	5.7
Transylvania	1	.2
Yugoslavia	21	4.8
Croatia	11	2.5
Montenegro	1	.2
Serbia	4	.9
Slovonia	6	1.4
Other USSR/Russia	28	6.3
European Turkey	5	1.1
Southwest Asia, nec/ns	1	.2
Total	441	100.0

Table 6 Crosstabulation of Political Status Paternal with Marital Status

			Marital status					
			Married, spouse present	Married, spouse absent	Divorced	Widowed	Never married/single (N/A)	Total
Political Status Paternal	Neutral	Count	78	6	0	1	113	198
		% within Political Status Paternal	39.4%	3.0%	.0%	.5%	57.1%	100.0%
	Allied	Count	116	15	1	5	236	373
		% within Political Status Paternal	31.1%	4.0%	.3%	1.3%	63.3%	100.0%
	Central	Count	131	4	3	3	273	414
		% within Political Status Paternal	31.6%	1.0%	.7%	.7%	65.9%	100.0%
	Irish	Count	10	1	0	0	24	35
		% within Political Status Paternal	28.6%	2.9%	.0%	.0%	68.6%	100.0%
	Central Subject	Count	203	24	0	4	210	441
		% within Political Status Paternal	46.0%	5.4%	.0%	.9%	47.6%	100.0%
	American	Count	800	37	6	12	1618	2473
		% within Political Status Paternal	32.3%	1.5%	.2%	.5%	65.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	1338	87	10	25	2474	3934
		% within Political Status Paternal	34.0%	2.2%	.3%	.6%	62.9%	100.0%

Table 7 **Birthplaces of Allies**

	Frequency	Percent
United States	194	52.0
Canada	15	4.0
Ontario/Upper Canada	1	.3
Newfoundland	1	.3
England	12	3.2
Scotland	6	1.6
Wales	3	.8
Ireland	10	2.7
Belgium	1	.3
France	2	.5
Italy	97	26.0
Austria	2	.5
Galicia	8	2.1
Russian Poland	2	.5
Lithuania	1	.3
Other USSR/Russia	17	4.6
Australia and New Zealand	1	.3
Total	373	100.0

Table 8 **ANOVA Table with Marital Status and Ethnicity**

			Experimental Method					
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	B
Case found in FTM CD	Main Effects	(Combined)	9.446	6	1.574	14.345	.000	
		Political Status Paternal	3.724	5	.745	6.786	.000	
		Marital Status as Binary	5.881	1	5.881	53.585	.000	
	Covariates	Approx Age on R-day	2.847	1	2.847	25.936	.000	-.013
	2-Way Interactions	Political Status Paternal * Marital Status as Binary	2.123	5	.425	3.870	.002	
	Model		14.416	12	1.201	10.946	.000	
	Residual		203.588	1855	.110			
	Total		218.004	1867	.117			

a Case found in FTM CD by Political Status Paternal, Marital Status as Binary with Approx Age on R-day
b Covariates entered after main effects

MCA(a)

				Predicted Mean			Deviation		
			N	Unadjusted	Adjusted for Factors	Adjusted for Factors and Covariates	Unadjusted	Adjusted for Factors	Adjusted for Factors and Covariates
Case found in FTM CD	Political Status Paternal	Neutral	125	.06	.06	.06	-.079	-.079	-.075
		Allied	217	.12	.10	.11	-.020	-.032	-.030
		Central	196	.13	.13	.13	-.002	-.010	-.003
		Irish	18	.28	.27	.27	.143	.132	.133
		CentralSubject	304	.07	.07	.07	-.066	-.062	-.061
		American	1008	.17	.17	.17	.032	.035	.032
	Marital Status as Binary	Unmarried	657	.21	.21	.20	.075	.077	.063
		Married	1211	.09	.09	.10	-.041	-.042	-.034

a Case found in FTM CD by Political Status Paternal, Marital Status as Binary with Approx Age on R-day

Table 9 Means Comparison of Ethno-political Groups

Duncan Socioeconomic Index

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Political Status Paternal	Neutral	32.14	125	22.807
	Allied	31.39	217	23.128
	Central	30.36	196	18.159
	Irish	36.72	18	21.668
	Central Subject	22.47	304	17.395
	American	30.30	1008	22.904
	Total	29.34	1868	21.841

Table 10 Birthplaces of German-Speakers

	Frequency	Percent
United States	348	84.1
Canada	1	.2
England	1	.2
Austria	20	4.8
Austria-Hungary	2	.5
Austria-Tyrol	1	.2
Germany	18	4.3
Bavaria	1	.2
Hanover	1	.2
Westphalia	1	.2
Prussia, nec	1	.2
Hungary	9	2.2
Poland	2	.5
Silesia	1	.2
West Prussia	1	.2
Russian Poland	3	.7
Romania	1	.2
Transylvania	1	.2
Other USSR/Russia	1	.2
Total	414	100.0

Table 11 Census Year Enumerated for Resident Aliens

		Frequency	Percent
Year	1910	206	30.9
	1920	461	69.1
	Total	667	100.0

Table 12 Crosstabulation of Political Status with Census Year for Resident Aliens

Count

		Census year		Total
		1910	1920	
Political Status Paternal	Neutral	44	92	136
	Allied	57	95	152
	Central	15	44	59
	Irish	2	3	5
	Central Subject	86	227	313
	American	2	0	2
Total		206	461	667

Table 13 Case Summaries of American Resident Aliens

			Census year	Age	Birthplace of father – Detailed	Birthplace of mother -- Detailed
Birthplace -- Detailed	Canada	1	1910	14	Michigan	Canada
		2	1910	18	Michigan	Canada

Table 14 Crosstabulation of Political Status with Military Selection for Resident Aliens

			Case found in FTM CD		
			Non Military	Military	Total
Political Status Paternal	Neutral	Count	132	4	136
		% within Political Status Paternal	97.1%	2.9%	100.0%
	Allied	Count	142	10	152
		% within Political Status Paternal	93.4%	6.6%	100.0%
	Central	Count	58	1	59
		% within Political Status Paternal	98.3%	1.7%	100.0%
	Irish	Count	5	0	5
		% within Political Status Paternal	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Central Subject	Count	302	11	313
		% within Political Status Paternal	96.5%	3.5%	100.0%
	American	Count	2	0	2
		% within Political Status Paternal	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	641	26	667
		% within Political Status Paternal	96.1%	3.9%	100.0%

Table 15 Proportions of Resident Aliens within Political Status Groupings

			Resident Alien		
			Citizen	Alien	Total
Political Status Paternal	Neutral	Count	62	136	198
		% within Political Status Paternal	31.3%	68.7%	100.0%
	Allied	Count	221	152	373
		% within Political Status Paternal	59.2%	40.8%	100.0%
	Central	Count	355	59	414
		% within Political Status Paternal	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
	Irish	Count	30	5	35
		% within Political Status Paternal	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
	Central Subject	Count	128	313	441
		% within Political Status Paternal	29.0%	71.0%	100.0%
	American	Count	2471	2	2473
		% within Political Status Paternal	99.9%	.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	3267	667	3934
		% within Political Status Paternal	83.0%	17.0%	100.0%

Table 16 Case Summaries of Discharged Enemy Aliens

		N	Census year	Year of immigration	Mother tongue of father – Detailed	Approx Age on R-day	Date of Enlistment	Date of Discharge
Birthplace – Detailed	Austria	1	1910	1909	Yiddish, Jewish	24	11/08/1917	03/05/1918
	Germany	1	1910	1909	German	22	10/05/1917	03/11/1918
	Hungary	1	1920	1906	Polish	30	10/05/1917	02/28/1918
	Galicia	1	1920	1903	Ruthenian	25	09/19/1917	02/12/1918

Table 17 Correlations between Income Index and Military Service (All Cases)

		Case found in FTM CD	Duncan Socioeconomic Index
Case found in FTM CD	Pearson Correlation	1	-.013
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.424
	N	3934	3934
Duncan Socioeconomic Index	Pearson Correlation	-.013	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.424	.
	N	3934	3934

Table 18 Occupational Categories

	Frequency	Percent
Unemployed	546	13.9
White-Collar	731	18.6
Unskilled Blue-Collar	705	17.9
Skilled Blue-Collar	1339	34.0
Farm Owner/Manager	171	4.3
Farm Worker	442	11.2
Total	3934	100.0

Table 19 **Crosstabulation of Military Selection with Occupational Categories**

			Occupational Categories						Total
			Unemployed	White-Collar	Unskilled Blue-Collar	Skilled Blue-Collar	Farm Owner/ Manager	Farm Worker	
Military Selection	Nonmilitary	Count	415	604	623	1161	154	381	3338
		% within Case found in FTM CD	12.4%	18.1%	18.7%	34.8%	4.6%	11.4%	100.0%
	Military	Count	131	127	82	178	17	61	596
		% within Case found in FTM CD	22.0%	21.3%	13.8%	29.9%	2.9%	10.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	546	731	705	1339	171	442	3934
		% within Case found in FTM CD	13.9%	18.6%	17.9%	34.0%	4.3%	11.2%	100.0%

Table 20 **Census Years of Unemployed**

		Frequency	Percent
Year	1910	501	92.4
	1920	41	7.6
	Total	542	100.0

Table 21 Crosstabulation of Age with Census Year for Unemployed

Count

		Census year		
		1910	1920	Total
Age	14	138	0	138
	15	99	0	99
	16	86	0	86
	17	61	0	61
	18	39	0	39
	19	31	0	31
	20	16	0	16
	21	9	0	9
	22	9	0	9
	23	8	0	8
	24	5	6	11
	25	0	5	5
	26	0	2	2
	27	0	8	8
	28	0	6	6
	29	0	1	1
	30	0	3	3
	32	0	4	4
	33	0	5	5
	34	0	1	1
Total		501	41	542

Table 22 Employment Rate by Age

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Approx Age on 5 June 1917	21	59.7765	358	49.10351
	22	69.1395	337	46.26047
	23	76.5333	375	42.43565
	24	81.3514	370	39.00262
	25	88.2507	383	32.24286
	26	91.1846	363	28.39105
	27	95.1031	388	21.60820
	28	97.1609	317	16.63502
	29	96.1538	338	19.25928
	30	96.3788	359	18.70773
	31	98.2609	345	13.09142
	Total	86.2227	3934	34.47057

Mean denotes rate of employment as a percentage. For each case employment=100 and unemployment=0

Table 23 Occupational Categories without Unemployed Cases

	Frequency	Percent
White-Collar	731	21.6
Unskilled Blue-Collar	705	20.8
Skilled Blue-Collar	1339	39.5
Farm Owner/ Manager	171	5.0
Farm Worker	442	13.0
Total	3388	100.0

Table 24 Crosstabulation of Occupational Categories with Conscription Status

			Occupational Categories						Total
			Unemployed	White-Collar	Unskilled Blue-Collar	Skilled Blue-Collar	Farm Owner/ Manager	Farm Worker	
Enlistment Status	Nonmilitary	Count	415	604	623	1161	154	381	3338
		% within Occupational Categories	76.0%	82.6%	88.4%	86.7%	90.1%	86.2%	84.9%
	Maybe influenced by events overseas	Count	8	1	6	2	0	4	21
		% within Occupational Categories	1.5%	.1%	.9%	.1%	.0%	.9%	.5%
	Volunteered ante Registration	Count	7	10	2	10	1	3	33
		% within Occupational Categories	1.3%	1.4%	.3%	.7%	.6%	.7%	.8%
	Volunteered post registration	Count	13	14	5	7	1	2	42
		% within Occupational Categories	2.4%	1.9%	.7%	.5%	.6%	.5%	1.1%
	Conscripted	Count	102	99	67	156	15	52	491
		% within Occupational Categories	18.7%	13.5%	9.5%	11.7%	8.8%	11.8%	12.5%
	Entered Prior to Conflict	Count	1	3	2	3	0	0	9
		% within Occupational Categories	.2%	.4%	.3%	.2%	.0%	.0%	.2%
Total		Count	546	731	705	1339	171	442	3934

Table 25 Crosstabulation of Military Selection and Occupational Categories Where Unemployed Cases Have Been Discarded

			Occupational Categories					Total
			White-Collar	Unskilled Blue-Collar	Skilled Blue-Collar	Farm Owner/Manager	Farm Worker	
Case found in FTM CD	NonMilitary	Count	604	623	1161	154	381	2923
		% within Case found in FTM CD	20.7%	21.3%	39.7%	5.3%	13.0%	100.0%
	Military	Count	127	82	178	17	61	465
		% within Case found in FTM CD	27.3%	17.6%	38.3%	3.7%	13.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	731	705	1339	171	442	3388
		% within Case found in FTM CD	21.6%	20.8%	39.5%	5.0%	13.0%	100.0%

Table 26 Approximate Age on Registration-day

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Occupational Categories	Unemployed	23.39	546	2.427
	White-Collar	26.14	731	3.065
	Unskilled Blue-Collar	26.57	705	3.061
	Skilled Blue-Collar	26.43	1339	3.061
	Farm Owner/Manager	27.35	171	2.939
	Farm Worker	25.85	442	2.816
	Total	25.95	3934	3.136

Table 27 Occupational Exemptions from the State of Ohio[36]

		N	Claims Filed	Claims Accepted	Percent
Work Exemption	Agricultural	30650	4127	1716	41.58
	Industrial	102200	3473	1297	37.34
	Total	132850	7600	3013	39.644

Where N is the estimated population based on 1910 and 1920 censuses

Table 28 Crosstabulation of Occupational Categories with Marital Status as Binary for Cases Enumerated in 1920

			Marital Status as Binary		
			Unmarried	Married	Total
Occupational Categories	Unemployed	Count	29	15	44
		% within Occupational Categories	65.9%	34.1%	100.0%
	White-Collar	Count	160	284	444
		% within Occupational Categories	36.0%	64.0%	100.0%
	Unskilled Blue-Collar	Count	145	342	487
		% within Occupational Categories	29.8%	70.2%	100.0%
	Skilled Blue-Collar	Count	272	429	701
		% within Occupational Categories	38.8%	61.2%	100.0%
	Farm Owner/ Manager	Count	17	111	128
		% within Occupational Categories	13.3%	86.7%	100.0%
	Farm Worker	Count	34	30	64
		% within Occupational Categories	53.1%	46.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	657	1211	1868
		% within Occupational Categories	35.2%	64.8%	100.0%

[36] Crowder, *Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War*, 89.

Table 29 **Crosstabulation of Occupational Categories with Military Selection for Cases Enumerated in the 1920 Census**

			Military Selection		
			NonMilitary	Military	Total
Occupational Categories	Unemployed	Count	36	8	44
		% within Occupational Categories	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%
	White-Collar	Count	373	71	444
		% within Occupational Categories	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%
	Unskilled Blue-Collar	Count	428	59	487
		% within Occupational Categories	87.9%	12.1%	100.0%
	Skilled Blue-Collar	Count	613	88	701
		% within Occupational Categories	87.4%	12.6%	100.0%
	Farm Owner/Manager	Count	112	16	128
		% within Occupational Categories	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	Farm Worker	Count	54	10	64
		% within Occupational Categories	84.4%	15.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	1616	252	1868
		% within Occupational Categories	86.5%	13.5%	100.0%

Table 30 **ANOVA Table of Military Selection with Class Factoring in Marital Status Controlling for Age on R-day (Cases Enumerated in 1920)**

ANOVA(a,b)

			Experimental Method					
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	B
Case found in FTM CD	Main Effects	(Combined)	5.804	5	1.161	10.418	.000	
		Occupational Categories	.442	4	.110	.991	.411	
		Marital Status as Binary	5.334	1	5.334	47.865	.000	
	Covariates	Approx Age on R-day	2.843	1	2.843	25.513	.000	-.013
	2-Way Interactions	Occupational Categories * Marital Status as Binary	.690	4	.172	1.547	.186	
	Model		9.337	10	.934	8.379	.000	
	Residual		202.023	1813	.111			
	Total		211.360	1823	.116			

a Case found in FTM CD by Occupational Categories, Marital Status as Binary with Approx Age on R-day
b Covariates entered after main effects

Table 31 **Multiple Classification Analysis of Military Selection with Class Factoring in Marital Status Controlling for Age on R-day (Cases Enumerated in 1920)**

				Predicted Mean			Deviation		
			N	Unadjusted	Adjusted for Factors	Adjusted for Factors and Covariates	Unadjusted	Adjusted for Factors	Adjusted for Factors and Covariates
Case found in FTM CD	Occupational Categories	White-Collar	444	.16	.16	.16	.026	.024	.021
		Unskilled Blue-Collar	487	.12	.13	.13	-.013	-.007	-.008
		Skilled Blue-Collar	701	.13	.12	.12	-.008	-.013	-.011
		Farm Owner/Manager	128	.13	.15	.16	-.009	.016	.022
		Farm Worker	64	.16	.13	.13	.022	.001	-.009
	Marital Status as Binary	Unmarried	628	.21	.21	.20	.075	.076	.063
		Married	1196	.09	.09	.10	-.039	-.040	-.033

a Case found in FTM CD by Occupational Categories, Marital Status as Binary with Approx Age on R-day

VITA

Michael Reza Saberian was born on June 5, 1980. He spent the subsequent 22 years of his life at 8703 Honeysuckle Trail, Austin, TX 78759, where he currently resides. His primary and secondary educations were spent in the Austin Independent School District. In May of 1998, he graduated L.C. Anderson High to attend the University of Texas at Austin. In 2002, he graduated from the University of Texas with a Bachelor of Arts in history and a minor in mathematics. During his undergraduate study, he worked as a contributing columnist to the *Daily Texan*, and he authored an undergraduate thesis: "The Flaming Sword and the Silent Mists: The Influence of Napalm and Chemical Defoliants on the Vietnam War," under the direction of Dr. Mark Lawrence. Upon graduation from UT-Austin, he went on to attend Texas A&M University to pursue a master's degree in history under the direction of Dr. Walter Kamphoefner. While pursuing graduate study in history, he has also sought teaching certification through Texas A&M's Department of Teaching, Learning, and Cultures.